

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application and stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Skinner (US 5,441,158).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a mobile device comprising:

means for moving along a runway in a predetermined path;

a receiving means for receiving and supporting the collected articles while moving along the runway in the predetermined path;

a radio-frequency (RF) interrogation means for obtaining identifying information on each of the articles collected by the device; and

comparison means for comparing the identifying information obtained with references relative to a determined order for articles and thus for validating the collected articles as the articles are collected along the runway.

In response, Applicants submit that skinner fails to disclose a mobile device meeting all the features recited in claim 1. Specifically, Skinner fails to disclose a mobile device for receiving and supporting collected articles while moving along the runway in a predetermined path.

In the rejection, the Examiner contends that Skinner's reader 178 corresponds to the recited mobile device. However, Applicants submit Skinner's reader 178 does not correspond to the recited "mobile device" for the following reasons. In particular, as recited in claim 1 the

mobile device requires a receiving means for receiving and supporting the collected articles while moving along the runway in the predetermined path.

In the Response to Arguments section of this Office Action, the Examiner provides:

[T]he mobile device (reader 178) does indeed move along a rail so to speak since the reader moves from a reading position to a retracted position along a horizontal arm 184 (col. 7, lines 43-62). Furthermore, the reader 178 does indeed receive the collected articles in that the reader takes in information transmitted from the article, the article having already been collected.

Office Action, p. 3.

However, Applicants submit that even if the reader 178 could somehow be construed as receiving the articles, Skinner fails to disclose or even fairly suggest that the reader 178 also supports the collected articles, as required by claim 1. Even if the Examiner's position that the reader 178 could be construed as receiving collected articles, Skinner nowhere suggests any supporting contact between any article and the reader 178. Rather, reader 178 is merely provided to read identifying information supplied with each hanger 49 so that articles can be identified.

Thus, Applicants submit Skinner fails to disclose a mobile device for receiving and supporting collected articles while moving along the runway, as recited in claim 1.

Consequently, Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason. Additionally, Applicants submit claims 2-11 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependencies.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Application No.: 10/733,417

Attorney Docket No.: Q106240

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/David P. Emery/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

David P. Emery
Registration No. 55,154

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 30, 2009